

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/743,382	12/23/2003	Manabu Kanzaki	12054-0022	7924
22902	7590 04/28/2006		EXAMINER	
CLARK & BRODY			ALEXANDER, MICHAEL P	
1090 VERMONT AVENUE, NW SUITE 250			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			1742	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Commons	10/743,382	KANZAKI, MANABU			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Michael P. Alexander	1742			
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONEI	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. C (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 F	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2006.				
•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims		•			
4) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attach mont(a)					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of References Cited (P10-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT0-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8 December 2004.	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/743,382

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagano et al. (JP 58-067854).

Regarding claims 1-2, Nagano teaches (pages 1-3) a nickel alloy having excellent resistance to intergranular stress corrosion cracking including, by mass %, C: up to 0.04%; Si: up to 1.0%; Mn: up to 1.0%; P: up to 0.03%; S: up to 0.005%; Cr: 15 to 35%; Ni: 50 to 80%; Al: up to 0.50%; Ti: 0.2 to 1.0%; and the balance Fe and impurities, which overlaps with the claimed ranges, which is prima facie evidence of obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05 I. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

Art Unit: 1742

select the desired amount of each of the elements from the ranges disclosed by Nagano because Nagano teaches the same utility throughout the disclosed ranges.

Still regarding claims 1-2, the Examiner asserts that the alloy of Nagano would inherently have a low angle boundary rate of 4% or more as for the grain boundaries, because Nagano teaches substantially the same composition and substantially the same processing (i.e. large amount of cold working followed by low temperature annealing - see Table 2). See MPEP 2112.01 I.

Regarding claim 3, Nagano does not necessitate adding any Co, Cu or V.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael P. Alexander whose telephone number is 571-272-8558. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy V. King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/743,382

Art Unit: 1742

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M/4 mpa ROY KING PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Page 4

رار